

Attorney Docket 000298C1

PATENT

## REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are pending in the present application.

Claims 1, 2, 4, and 5 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Weissman. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

To anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or impliedly. (MPEP 706.02.) Independent claim 1 recites, among other things, "conveying the first and second slave signals separately to a base station transceiver subsystem (BTS) external to the region" (underlining added for emphasis). Applicant submits that the cited reference does not teach the combination defined by the claim, particularly the quoted limitation. Thus, the claim is patentably distinguishable over the cited reference.

Accordingly, the rejection of the independent claim 1, and claims 2, 4, and 5 at least by virtue of their dependency on allowable claim 1, under 35 USC 102(e) should be withdrawn in the next Office action. If this rejection is maintained in the next Office action, Applicant respectfully requests a pinpoint cite to the column and line number of the reference for the teaching.

Claims 3, and 6-10 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weissman in view of Bassrat. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 3 is allowable at least by virtue of its dependency on allowable claim 1 as argued in overcoming the 102(e) rejection.

Independent claim 6 recites, among other things, "a second master unit, which receives and processes the second slave signal from the second plurality of slave transceivers and conveys the processed second signal to the BTS separately from the processed first signal, such that information contained in the RF signal is recovered by processing the first and second processed signals received by the BTS" (underlining added for emphasis). Applicant submits that the cited Weissman reference does not teach the combination defined by the claim, particularly the quoted limitation. Thus, the claim is patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

## Attorney Docket 000298C1

## PATENT

Accordingly, the rejection of the independent claim 6, and claims 7-10 at least by virtue of their dependency on allowable claim 6, under 35 USC 103(a) should be withdrawn in the next Office action.

Claims 1-10 are now presented and considered to be in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all claims.

In light of the foregoing, the Examiner's reconsideration of this application with a view toward allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned agent if a telephone call could help solve any remaining items.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 2/7/03  
QUALCOMM Incorporated  
5775 Morehouse Drive  
San Diego, California 92121-2779  
Telephone: (858) 658-5928  
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502

By: Donald C. Kordich  
Donald C. Kordich  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 38,213